



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

national standards chiefly in connection with military enterprises led ultimately to the universal association of the idea of a flag with that of war and the deeds of war.

Unfortunately, much of this old idea still clings to the flags of many countries, in some measure to those of all. We met not long ago in Europe a gentleman who strongly opposed the display of national flags at the Universal Peace Congress on the ground that they were symbols of international animosity and strife. He characterized them on this account as "vile rags." Some of the friends of peace in Europe at first objected to the use of national flags, even with a white border, on the same ground, and were induced to favor it only when convinced of the possibility of converting what had hitherto been emblems of war into emblems of peace. We have often found it difficult to understand that sentimental, unthinking attachment to a flag which manifests itself in loud, noisy demonstration whenever the national emblem is spoken of. The class of people who are most addicted to it seems to indicate that it is a survival of the old feelings and sentiments growing out of the selfish and narrow and exclusive idea of nationality.

But is there no higher idea of a flag? Can not the selfish and narrow ideas and sentiments that cluster about it be made to give place to something more noble and worthy? We believe this can be done, though the change will be by no means an easy one. These national emblems can not be destroyed, even if any should wish to destroy them. They must be transformed in meaning and made instruments of unity and harmony. As they have been made the means of unifying the national life in conquest and hatred and destruction, they must be made to serve as means of unifying it in the carrying out of the deeper and nobler purposes for which nations are called into being. The time may come in the evolution of the unity of humanity when they can be dispensed with, but that time is not now. A new patriotism must be built up around them, which will kindle into enthusiasm for the new conceptions of national greatness and glory as the old did for the false and fading glory of the past.

This transformation in the meaning of the flag has already advanced somewhat in some countries. The Union Jack of Great Britain is not altogether a symbol of greed and national haughtiness. It has begun to stand also for unity and for the principles of righteousness and fairness and freedom which prevail so largely to-day among the British people. The same is true to some degree of the flags of other European countries. The stars and stripes were from the beginning an emblem of peace and unity. They are out of place in war. They first waved over a united nation built up out of jealous and contending colonies. Our flag was not merely created to express this incipient unity, but it stands more and more for unity and peace as state after

state comes into the Union and star after star is added to the cluster. It stands more and more also for each and all of those great principles of government which have made us free and strong. Not a star or stripe of it signifies opposition to other lands. It is a flag of peace. The children in the schools must be taught to regard it as a symbol of these great principles. Their infantile enthusiasm, when they lift their hands and pledge their youthful allegiance to "their flag," must be guided to an intelligent conception of the new and higher significance of this emblem of our national life. If this is not done, thoroughly and patiently, the placing of the flag on every schoolhouse, flag-day and flag-exercises will become a serious peril to the nation. There is already clear evidence that in places these exercises are awakening and strengthening in the children's minds the very ideas which ought never to be allowed to take root on American soil. We cannot afford to have our children, under pretence of patriotism, imbibe the notion that this earth exists for the United States alone, and that we ought to flaunt our flag menacingly and haughtily in the faces of all other peoples. Let the emblem be stripped of every vestige of the idea that national glory is to be acquired by aggression and bloodshed. Let it be made to stand in the minds of the children not only for liberty but also for brotherhood and helpful coöperation. Otherwise the present revival of the flag is in danger of degenerating into a selfish, sentimental, blind flag-worship whose influence over the immediate future of our national life will be anything but wholesome and elevating.

A GREATER WAR POSSIBLE.

Among the speakers at the dedication of the national military park of Chickamauga on the 18th of last month and succeeding days was General Lew Wallace. He made a strong, almost a passionate plea for fraternity between the North and the South. He went as far as any Northern man has ever gone in granting that the Southern soldiers were perfectly honest in believing that their cause was right. They died for it. "Can a man furnish better proof of his honesty? Ah, no! And instead of spitting on his grave, I would libate it with a cup mixed in equal parts of sorrow and admiration." Nothing could be more admirable than those passages of his speech referring to the friendliness of Lincoln and Grant towards the South. Speaking of the great President he used these words: "In the heat of trials which would have burned love of their fellows out of other men, he practised a patience never before exemplified but in one instance, and dealt his enemies such exceeding charity that they were none the less his friends. * * In all that time there was not an hour in which he did not recognize the Confederates, even those in arms, as his countrymen. * * In the archives of the government there are

many judgments of death, but not one bearing his signature."

His characterization of General Grant's entire freedom from the spirit of vengeance was no less noble and true. "Literally he fed the hungry, clothed the naked and set the revolted States on their feet by returning their people to them." In the name of these two great "peacemakers of blessed memory" he appealed to his Northern Comrades not to go about "mouthing curses" toward the men of the South.

It is a great satisfaction to all true citizens of our republic to know that the gulf of bitter feeling between the North and the South is so nearly filled up, and every such effort as that of General Wallace at Chickamauga to obliterate it entirely has our unqualified endorsement. But when in the same address, he turned his attention to our relations to other countries he seems to us to have gone as far wrong as he was right in the matter of our internal relations. The following passage seems to be the utterance of a man of another spirit:

The argument in favor of perfected fraternity most potent with me is in the fact that we may be plunged into war any day. We are not popular with the titled and governing classes of Europe. With kings and emperors nothing is easier found than causes of quarrel; if one does not exist when wanted, they can make it. The firing of a gun may embroil us with Spain. Will France liberate Waller, return him his franchise and indemnify him? Shall we permit Japan to go on searching our vessels? Shall we allow England the slice she claims of Alaskan Territory? England invites herself to be a partner with us in the Nicaraguan Canal; we can better afford to give her all Alaska than yield to that demand. The commercial advantages of exclusive ownership of the Isthmean transit are stupendous; and think you while the powers now dominating everything are combining the earth for markets, they will surrender the Americas to our purveyorship without a struggle? Indeed, it is worth our while to speculate on the conditions the next war will offer. There is a lesson for us in the recent experience of Japan. The Mikado thought to make the Chinese pay the cost he had been put to in conquering them; he fancied he had a precedent in the German settlement with France; but Russia, Germany and France called him down, and he is now chewing the bitter cud.

He could not fight the Alliance. Can we? That depends. Divided, we will be beaten; united, we can stand single-handed against the world. It will be a great war. Whether or not it leaves us masters to the North Pole, two things are certain: We will have tested thoroughly if we can live independently of outside relations, and all the differences, jealousies and prejudices engendered by the recent civil war will be laid forever. By winning, we will have magnificently complemented the war of 1776; in that contest we became independent of England; in the far greater one coming, we should aim at nothing short of independence of all but God. If there be one listening to call this jingoism, let him be reminded that we have already flung our glove to the kings, and that when they choose to pick it up, they will find it inscribed with a legend—"The Monroe Doctrine."

Does Mr. Wallace mean to say that "perfected fraternity" between the North and the South is more to be desired as a war-preparation against foreign countries than for its own sake? The two great "peacemakers of blessed memory" to whom he appeals in behalf of such fraternity would have rebuked an utterance of this kind if it had been made in their presence. The great war which Europeans have supposed would be fought between powers on that continent General Wallace pretends to think will fall upon us. These powers are getting ready for it. They do not like us. If there is no cause of quarrel they will make one. Even little Spain that can not suppress an insurrection in Cuba is burning to have a tilt with us, and goes about the ocean firing off her guns to entice us to battle. It is hard to treat such talk as this seriously. Mr. Wallace knows, if he would stop to think, that the firing of a gun did not embroil us with Spain, and that a war between that country and this is absolutely impossible, inconceivable.

The rhetoric of the rest of this passage is quite as swollen. We beg to suggest to the General that Mr. Waller will be liberated and indemnified by France, if it is found that he ought to be, and this without the least threat of war. France wants not war but a treaty of arbitration with this country and her Deputies have voted unanimously for it. Japan has the friendliest feeling in the world for us, and has not carried the searching of suspected vessels to any alarming extent. England will get the slice of Alaska which she claims, if it is hers, otherwise not. Only a General who thought this country did wrong in submitting the seal question to arbitration could imagine that a war may arise between the United States and Great Britain on account of the border of Alaska. But all Alaska had better go than the Nicaragua Canal! We must have that, if we have to fight the fine-toothed comb of all the powers to get it! Was the author of "Ben-Hur" playing with fancies when he told the soldiers of the blue and of the gray at Chickamauga that this country united could "stand single-handed against the world"? Does he know how many millions of people the other nations have and how large their fleets and armies are! That "we should aim at nothing short of independence of all but God" is about the richest suggestion as to America's destiny that we have ever met with. Why not go on and drive Him out and take possession of "the river of life" for commercial purposes? The Great White Throne for America would be a splendid rallying cry and would certainly result in bringing the North and the South into perfect unity.

We do not wonder that it occurred to General Wallace while he was pouring out this stream of rhetoric that he had gotten into the full tide of jingoism, and that he felt the necessity of trying to prevent others from thinking so, too, by calling in the legend of the Monroe Doctrine.

Since writing the above we learn that General Wallace, for lack of time at the dedication of the Chickamauga park, did not deliver his speech. It has, however, been printed and sent out to all parts of the land. It is matter of great regret that he spoiled an otherwise admirable address by the addition of this passage whose utter unreasonableness is only matched by its ridiculous rhetoric. Those who are really acquainted with the European governments and peoples know that they are not seeking a quarrel with us and that there is not the faintest prospect of such a great war as Mr. Wallace here invokes to cement the North and the South together. It is impossible to reprobate too strongly such attempts as this to inflame our people with hatred towards other lands. We belong to the family of nations and it is just as wicked to keep up angry and bitter feelings towards them as it is for Northern and Southern men to go about "mouthing curses" towards one another. By all means let us forgive and forget the great sin of the South. But in the name of our common Christianity, of our common humanity, nay more, of our historic American love of truth, justice and peace, let us not insensibly provoke the peoples of other lands to despise and hate us by imputing to them base motives and feelings which they do not cherish. If it is noble for Americans to forgive one another, it is still more noble, humane and Christian for them to seek friendship and peace with the great family of man, without whose sympathetic co-operation our beloved country can never be what God has intended it should be.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

We have received a copy of the annual report of the London Peace Society printed in pamphlet form. It covers twenty-six pages and contains the able and comprehensive report read by the Secretary, Dr. Darby, at the annual meeting of the Society, and also the Treasurer's annual statement. The Constitution of the Society is, also, prefixed to the report.

On another page will be found an article by Rev. W. B. Forbush of Yarmouth, N. S., giving some account of a new organization for boys, called "The Knights of King Arthur." We do not as yet know enough about the details of the organization and its practical working to give an intelligent judgment as to its merits. It is certainly not open to several of the most serious objections which can be brought against the Boys' Brigade. In fact, it has been founded to meet the needs of boys, without subjecting them to the grave evils inherent in the Brigade organization. We gladly give place to Mr. Forbush's explanation of the principles and purposes of the organization, which our readers will be able to examine and pronounce judgment upon for themselves. The boy problem is confessedly one of the most perplexing with

which the church, and general society also, has to deal, and all conscientious attempts to solve it in a manner consistent with Christian principles should be welcomed by all Christian people.

Mr. N. L. Højberg has written a small manual of history for use in Danish schools. It is written from the standpoint, not of the glorification of war, but of the proper estimate of the philanthropist, the scientist, the artist, the inventor, the engineer, the agriculturalist and other useful citizens, in the advancement of civilization. The book is published by Mr. Jens Möllers at Helsingør, Denmark.

The Institute of International Law held its annual meeting at Cambridge, England, in August. It was well attended and representative in character. Its sessions were presided over by Professor Westlake. Members were present from several different European countries. Important questions were discussed touching the mutual interests of the nations, such as copyright, privileges of ambassadors, bankruptcy, contraband of war, etc. The most interesting discussions were on the subjects of contraband of war and nationality. The meeting was one of the best ever held by the Institute.

The Catholics of France have addressed the following letter to the Catholics of other countries:

"We address you because we desire to call your attention to a subject which is now occupying the thoughts of many people. Separated as we are by differences of nationality, we are closely united in the same faith, the Fatherland of our souls.

"How true are the following words of Leo XIII., recently addressed to the Princes and Peoples of the world:

"We have under our consideration the present situation in Europe. For many years, during a time of peace—which is more apparent than real—we have seen all the nations tormented by suspicion of their neighbors, and rivalling one another in preparations for war. Youths, while still at a thoughtless age, are removed from the counsel and guidance of their parents, and placed in the midst of the temptations of military life. The young and strong are withdrawn from the cultivation of the soil, from study, from art, and are forced to devote themselves for long years to the trade of arms. This occasions an enormous waste of resources, and the consequent exhaustion of the public treasury. It is a fatal injury to the prosperity of nations, and to the well-being of individuals. The burden of this armed peace has become so heavy that we can no longer support it. Is this the natural state of society? . . . We can hardly realize how rapid would be the progress of the nations toward a greatness undreamed of as yet, were Peace once firmly established."

"Do not the evils here so forcibly pointed out by our Holy Father, Leo XIII., arise in great part from our not having learned to bring our practice into accordance with our principles?

"If it is criminal to take the life of one fellow-creature,